

- REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN BOB DOLE -

LET ME SAY AT THE OUTSET THAT SINCE NOVEMBER 5 I HAVE BEEN LITERALLY FLOODED WITH REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION ABOUT FEDERAL JOBS WHICH MAY BE OPENING UP IN JANUARY 1969. AS YOU MIGHT KNOW, THERE HAS BEEN A GREAT DEAL OF SPECULATION ABOUT THE NEXT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE. THE PERSON APPOINTED SHOULD BE A STRONG AND INDEPENDENT SPOKESMAN FOR THE FARMER FOR, IN MY OPINION, RURAL AMERICA IS AT THE CROSSROADS.

ELECTION REFLECTIONS

FIRST OF ALL, LET US START WITH WHERE WE WERE AFTER CATCHING UP ON OUR SLEEP LAST NOVEMBER 5.

ON THE PRESIDENTIAL SIDE IT SEEMS APPARENT THAT MR. NIXON AND MR. AGNEW GENERALLY DID QUITE WELL IN THE FARM AND RURAL AREAS OF THE NATION. THEIR NARROW VICTORY WAS DUE IN GREAT PART TO THE FACT THAT THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE VOTES OF ONLY THREE "FARM STATES" (TEXAS, MINNESOTA AND MICHIGAN) WENT INTO THE HUMPHREY-MUSKIE COLUMN.

FOR EXAMPLE, ACCORDING TO THE NOVEMBER 18, 1968, ISSUE OF U. S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT MIDWESTERN FARMERS VOTED HEAVILY FOR THE NIXON-AGNEW TICKET.

IN 74 NORTHWEST IOWA TOWNSHIPS MR. NIXON RECEIVED 64 PERCENT OF THE VOTE, MR. HUMPHREY 30 PERCENT AND MR. WALLACE 6 PERCENT. IN 31 NORTHWEST INDIANA TOWNSHIPS IT WAS MR. NIXON 56 PERCENT, MR. HUMPHREY 31 PERCENT, AND MR. WALLACE 13 PERCENT.

IN 153 SOUTHERN MINNESOTA TOWNSHIPS IT WAS MR. NIXON 51 PERCENT, MR. HUMPHREY 44 PERCENT, AND MR. WALLACE 5 PERCENT.

IN 76 WESTERN KANSAS TOWNSHIPS THE RESULTS WERE MR. NIXON 59 PERCENT, MR. HUMPHREY 30 PERCENT, AND MR. WALLACE 11 PERCENT.

IN THESE SAME STATES RESIDENTS OF SMALL TOWNS ALSO VOTED FOR THE NIXON-AGNEW TICKET BY 54 PERCENT TO 66 PERCENT MARGINS.

IN THE U.S. SENATE RACES, WHERE DEMOCRATS WON 18 AND REPUBLICANS WON 16 CONTESTS, THERE WAS A NET REPUBLICAN GAIN OF 5 SEATS. (THE G.O.P. PICKED UP DEMOCRATIC SEATS IN 7 STATES -- OREGON, ARIZONA, OKLAHOMA, OHIO, PENNSYLVANIA, FLORIDA AND MARYLAND, WHILE LOSING IN IOWA AND CALIFORNIA.)

THE NEW SENATE, THEREFORE, WILL BE DIVIDED IN A 58 DEMOCRATIC TO 42 REPUBLICAN RATIO RATHER THAN THE PRESENT 63 - 37 SPLIT.

IN THE MIDWEST, DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATES PREVAILED IN FIVE STATES CARRIED BY THE NIXON-AGNEW TICKET (SOUTH DAKOTA, IOWA, MISSOURI, WISCONSIN AND INDIANA) AND OF THE 18 STATES CARRIED BY DEMOCRATIC SENATORIAL CANDIDATES ONLY THREE (HAWAII, WASHINGTON AND CONNECTICUT) WERE CARRIED BY THE HUMPHREY-MUSKIE TICKET. OF THE 16 STATES CARRIED BY REPUBLICAN SENATORIAL CANDIDATES ONLY THREE (MARYLAND, PENNSYLVANIA AND NEW YORK) WERE CARRIED BY THE DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL TICKET.

OF THE TOTAL 34 SENATE RACES, WHICH SPLIT 18-16 IN FAVOR OF THE DEMOCRATS, THE NIXON-AGNEW TICKET CARRIED 24 STATES, HUMPHREY-MUSKIE CARRIED 6 STATES, AND WALLACE-LEMAY 4 STATES.

OVERALL, IT APPEARS THAT THE SENATE IN THE 91ST CONGRESS WILL BE CHANGED MORE SIGNIFICANTLY THAN THE HOUSE. NOT ONLY DOES THE NET 5 SEAT REPUBLICAN GAIN MEAN A NUMERICAL CHANGE, BUT THE DEFEAT OF RETIREMENT OF A NUMBER OF SENIOR MEMBERS AND THEIR REPLACEMENT BY YOUNGER MEN ALSO HERALDS ADDITIONAL CHANGE. OF THE 34 SENATORS ELECTED ON NOVEMBER 5, 14 WILL BE NEW FACES IN THE 91ST CONGRESS.

ON THE HOUSE SIDE 1968 CAN CERTAINLY BE LABELED THE "YEAR OF THE INCUMBENT". IF 1968 WAS GOOD FOR INCUMBENTS IN GENERAL, IT WAS GREAT FOR REPUBLICAN INCUMBENTS. ONLY ONE INCUMBENT G.O.P. SENATOR LOST IN 1968 -- (SENATOR KUCHEL IN THE CALIFORNIA PRIMARY) AND ONLY THREE REPUBLICAN HOUSE MEMBERS (REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON OF WYOMING IN A PRIMARY AND REPRESENTATIVES BOLTON OF OHIO AND SMITH OF OKLAHOMA IN RACES AGAINST DEMOCRATIC INCUMBENTS).

IN THE GENERAL ELECTION IN THE HOUSE ONLY 5 DEMOCRATS LOST TO CANDIDATES OTHER THAN INCUMBENTS. THUS, WHEN THE POLITICAL ARITHMETIC IS TOTALLED FOR THE HOUSE, ONLY 9 STATE DELEGATIONS CHANGED THEIR LINE-UPS BY GIVING REPUBLICANS 7 MORE SEATS IN 6 STATES WHILE DEMOCRATS WERE PICKING UP 3 SEATS IN 3 OTHER STATES. THE NET RESULT OF ALL THIS IS THAT THE NEW HOUSE WILL BE VIRTUALLY UNCHANGED WITH REPUBLICANS PICKING UP 4 SEATS FOR A TOTAL OF 192, WHILE DEMOCRATS RETAIN A 51 VOTE MARGIN WITH 243 SEATS.

AS THINGS TURNED OUT, 1968 SAW THE BIGGEST CHANGE IN THE SENATE AND THE SMALLEST CHANGE IN THE HOUSE IN THE LAST DECADE.

YES, THIS YEAR'S RESULT IS INTERESTING IN COMPARISON TO RECENT CONGRESSIONAL ELECTIONS.

IN 1966, FOR EXAMPLE, THE ELECTORATE OUSTED 46 HOUSE MEMBERS AND ONE SENATOR.

IN 1964 FOUR SENATORS AND 43 HOUSE INCUMBENTS WERE DEFEATED WITH A TOTAL OF 91 NEW MEMBERS BEING ELECTED.

IN 1962, 22 HOUSE INCUMBENTS AND 5 SENATORS WERE REPLACED.

IN 1960 - 26 HOUSE MEMBERS AND 1 SENATOR LOST.

IN 1958 - 35 HOUSE MEMBERS AND 10 SENATORS LOST THEIR SEATS WITH A TOTAL OF 99 NEW MEMBERS BEING ELECTED.

CHANGE IN AGRICULTURE COMMITTEES

THE NET CHANGE OF 5 SENATE SEATS WILL PROBABLY CHANGE THE RATIO OF THE SENATE AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY COMMITTEE, WHICH IS NOW 10 - 5 DEMOCRATIC. ALL FIVE MEMBERS OF THAT COMMITTEE SEEKING REELECTION IN 1968 WERE SUCCESSFUL. (SENATORS TALMADGE, MCGOVERN, HOLLINGS, AIKEN AND YOUNG).

THE SMALL CHANGE IN OVERALL HOUSE MEMBERSHIP PROBABLY WILL NOT ALTER THE OVERALL RATIO OF THE HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE, WHICH IS NOW 20 - 15 DEMOCRATIC.

ALTHOUGH ONLY ONE COMMITTEE MEMBER WAS DEFEATED (REPRESENTATIVE DOW OF NEW YORK) THERE WILL BE 6 OTHER VACANCIES ON THE COMMITTEE AS THE RESULT OF RETIREMENT (REPRESENTATIVE GATHINGS OF ARKANSAS AND REPRESENTATIVE JONES OF MISSOURI), SENATE RACES (REPRESENTATIVE DOLE OF KANSAS, REPRESENTATIVE HANSEN OF IDAHO AND REPRESENTATIVE RESNICK OF NEW YORK) AND RESIGNATION (REPRESENTATIVE STUCKEY OF GEORGIA).

THE SINGLE MOST APPARENT ELECTION REELECTION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL VANTAGE POINT SEEMS TO BE THAT THE NEW ADMINISTRATION WILL HAVE TO DEAL WITH PRETTY MUCH THE SAME CONGRESS THAT THE OLD ADMINISTRATION CONTENTENDED WITH FOR THE PAST TWO YEARS. THE MAJOR DIFFERENCE, OF COURSE, WILL BE THAT THERE WILL BE A DIVISION OF PARTY CONTROL BETWEEN THE LEGISLATIVE AND EXECUTIVE BRANCHES FOR THE FIRST TIME IN 8 YEARS. THUS, THE NATION NOW FINDS ITS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DIVIDED IN A MANNER SIMILAR TO THAT UNDER WHICH THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION OPERATED FOR SIX OF ITS EIGHT YEARS.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

FOR THE FIRST TIME SINCE 1876 A NEW ADMINISTRATION IS FACED WITH A CONGRESS CONTROLLED BY THE OPPOSITE POLITICAL PARTY. THAT IS A FACT.

MR. NIXON AND MR. AGNEW WON THE ELECTION AND ARE THE CHOICE OF VOTERS IN 32 STATES HAVING 302 ELECTORAL VOTES. THAT ALSO IS A FACT.

IN AGRICULTURE AT LEAST, WHERE WE GO FROM HERE IS, AT THIS POINT, MOSTLY HYPOTHESIS.

A GREAT DEAL WILL DEPEND ON EVENTS IN ASIA AND OTHER FOREIGN NATIONS, AS WELL AS UPON EFFORTS AND RESULTS HERE AT HOME IN MEETING OUR PRESSING DOMESTIC PROBLEMS. THE NATURE AND COMPOSITION OF THE PRESIDENT'S CABINET WILL BE AN IMPORTANT FACTOR THAT WILL AFFECT THE EXECUTIVE-LEGISLATIVE RELATIONSHIP. AND IT REMAINS WITHOUT SAYING THAT THE SKILL, EXPERIENCE AND ABILITY OF THE NEW SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE WILL BE FULLY TAXED BY THE COMPETING RIGORS OF THAT DIFFICULT OFFICE.

RATHER THAN ATTEMPTING TO SPECULATE OVER A LOT OF UNPREDICTABLE PHENOMENA, IT WOULD PERHAPS BE MORE FRUITFUL TO EXPLORE THE GENERAL OUTLOOK FOR AGRICULTUREL POLICY DEVELOPMENT, AS WELL AS SOME OF THE MAJOR PROBLEMS WHICH MUST BE DEALT WITH IF WE ARE TO BUILD A SOUND AND STRONG SYSTEM OF FARM PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION FOR TODAY AND TOMORROW.

THE VERY FIRST THING TO DO IS TO EXAMINE THE POSSIBLE TIMING OF NEW LEGISLATION.

FOR A STARTER, IT APPEARS TO ME THAT THERE WILL BE VERY LITTLE MAJOR CHANGE IN FARM PROGRAMS FOR AT LEAST A YEAR, FOR TWO MAIN REASONS. THESE ARE:

FIRST, THERE IS NO TIME DEADLINE OR EXPIRATION DATE ON MAJOR LEGISLATION TO BE MET RIGHT AWAY.

SECOND, THE NEW ADMINISTRATION AND THE 91ST CONGRESS ARE GOING TO TAKE A LITTLE WHILE GETTING ORGANIZED AND GETTING TO KNOW EACH OTHER.

AT THIS POINT, LET US EXAMINE THE PRESENT STATUS OF MAJOR FARM LEGISLATION. UNDER PRESENT LAW MOST COMMODITY PROGRAMS ARE "PERMANENT" IN THE SENSE THAT AUTHORITY EXISTS FOR THESE PROGRAMS UNTIL SUCH TIME AS IT MAY BE CHANGED. IN BRIEF, THE MAJOR COMMODITY PROGRAMS SHAPE UP LIKE THIS:

THE PRESENT FEED GRAIN PROGRAM RUNS THROUGH THE 1970 CROP WITH PERMANENT LAW PROVIDING PRICE SUPPORTS FOR CORN AT SUCH LEVELS FROM 50 TO 90 PERCENT OF PARITY THAT THE SECRETARY DETERMINES "WILL NOT RESULT IN INCREASING CCC STOCKS OF CORN". OTHER FEED GRAIN PRICE SUPPORTS WOULD BE SET BY THE SECRETARY AT LEVELS FROM ZERO TO 90 PERCENT OF PARITY.

THE PRESENT WHEAT CERTIFICATE PROGRAM RUNS THROUGH THE 1970 CROP WITH PERMANENT LAW THEREAFTER PROVIDING FARMERS A REFERENDUM CHOICE BETWEEN MANDATORY PROGRAMS OR PRICE SUPPORTS TO COOPERATORS AT 50 PERCENT OF PARITY.

THE PRESENT COTTON PROGRAM RUNS THROUGH THE 1970 CROP WITH PERMANENT LAW PROVIDING A MANDATORY PROGRAM WITH PRICE SUPPORTS AT 65 - 90 PERCENT OF PARITY.

THE NATIONAL WOOL ACT OF 1954, AS AMENDED, EXPIRES IN DECEMBER, 1970.

THE DAIRY, TOBACCO, PEANUT AND RICE PROGRAMS, AS WELL AS DISCRETIONARY PRICE SUPPORT, MARKETING ORDER, AND MARKET DIVERSION PROGRAMS, ARE PERMANENT AUTHORITIES.

THE CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM IS AUTHORIZED THROUGH DECEMBER 1970.

THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM IS AUTHORIZED THROUGH DECEMBER 1970.

PUBLIC LAW 480 RUNS THROUGH DECEMBER 1970.

THE SUGAR ACT RUNS THROUGH DECEMBER 1971.

I CITE THESE TERMINATION DATES MAINLY TO ILLUSTRATE THAT ANY PRESSURE TO CHANGE ANY CURRENT PROGRAMS RIGHT AWAY WILL BE OFFSET BY THE FACT THAT THEIR EXPIRATION DATES ARE AT LEAST A YEAR AWAY.

THIS IS NOT TO SAY THAT ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES CAN'T AND WON'T BE MADE. SOME OF THIS LEGISLATION GRANTS BROAD DISCRETIONARY POWERS TO THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

THIS IS NOT TO SAY EITHER THAT SOME MODIFICATIONS OR AMENDMENTS TO THE EXISTING PROGRAMS WON'T BE MADE.

THE MOST IMPORTANT AND CONTROVERSIAL CHANGE IS OF COURSE POSSIBLE LIMITATIONS ON PAYMENTS. IN THE 90TH CONGRESS, AS YOU KNOW, THE SENATE, SOMETIMES BY VERY CLOSE VOTES, REJECTED PAYMENT LIMITATIONS. THE HOUSE, IN ITS ONLY RECORD VOTE (230-160) ON THE QUESTION, APPROVED A \$20,000 LIMITATION ON COTTON, FEED GRAINS, WHEAT, AND WOOL PAYMENTS. WHILE THE FINAL BILL EXTENDING THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1965 FOR ONE YEAR DID NOT CONTAIN A PAYMENT LIMITATION, THE ISSUE IS FAR FROM DEAD, AND IT IS INDEED QUESTIONABLE WHETHER THE PRESENT PAYMENT PROGRAMS CAN LONG SURVIVE WITHOUT SOME FORM OF LIMITATIONS.

HERE ARE SOME STRAWS IN THE POLITICAL WIND:

--- A RECENT POLL BY AN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE ORGANIZATION INDICATED THAT 85 PERCENT OF ITS COMMERCIAL FARM RESPONDENTS FAVORED THE \$20,000 PAYMENT LIMITATION.

--- DURING THE RECENT PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN, VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY STATED THAT HE FAVORED A LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS.

--- PRESIDENT JOHNSON HAS ORDERED A STUDY BY USDA OF THE FEASIBILITY OF LIMITATIONS ON PAYMENTS.

--- REPRESENTATIVE PAUL FINDLEY OF ILLINOIS, A PRINCIPAL AUTHOR OF PAYMENT LIMITATIONS HAS, TOGETHER WITH A NUMBER OF HOUSE REPUBLICANS, REPEATEDLY ATTEMPTED TO AMEND VARIOUS LEGISLATIVE AND APPROPRIATION BILLS TO SECURE A PAYMENT LIMITATION.

THE HISTORY OF FARM PROGRAMS IN RECENT YEARS, HOWEVER, HAS BEEN THAT EXTENSIONS OR CHANGES IN MAJOR PROGRAMS HAVE NOT OCCURRED UNTIL THOSE PROGRAMS ARE NEAR AN EXPIRATION DATE.

WITH A DIVIDED GOVERNMENT RADICAL CHANGE IN MAJOR FARM PROGRAMS SEEMS UNLIKELY. AS IN THE PAST, EVOLUTION, NOT REVOLUTION, SEEMS TO BE THE PATTERN FOR A WHILE. BUT THE SHOW-DOWN MUST EVENTUALLY COME ON THE NATURE AND DIRECTION OF THE COMMODITY PROGRAMS. WILL THEY BE BASED ON GOVERNMENT "SUPPLY MANAGEMENT" OR BE "MARKET ORIENTED"? THE DIALOGUE AND DEBATE ON THIS ISSUE HAS BEEN LONG AND SOMETIMES HEATED. THE PROBLEMS OF PRICE AND PRODUCTION CANNOT BE IGNORED, AND GOVERNMENT POLICY MUST EVENTUALLY BE DETERMINED.

LET ME READ AN EXCERPT FROM A REPORT FROM THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON
AGRICULTURE TO ILLUSTRATE:

" * * * * WHILE THE PRODUCTIVE POWERS OF THE COUNTRY
HAVE INCREASED WITH UNPARALLELED RAPIDITY, ITS FOREIGN AND
ACCUSTOMED MARKETS HAVE BEEN RAPIDLY DIMINISHING. SUPPLY HAS
EXCEEDED DEMAND. THE ORDINARY PRODUCTIONS OF AGRICULTURE
HAVE USUALLY BEEN SUPERABUNDANT; BUT THE PRICES WHICH THEY
HAVE COMMANDED HAVE NOT REPAID TO LABOR AND CAPITAL THEIR JUST
REWARD."

WHEN DO YOU SUPPOSE THAT WAS WRITTEN? THIS YEAR? IN THE '50'S?
IN THE '30'S? NO, IT WAS WRITTEN 139 YEARS AGO IN HOUSE REPORT NO. 49,
20TH CONGRESS, JANUARY 19, 1829.

THE PROBLEM OF LOW PRICES AND HIGH COSTS TODAY IS EQUALLY ACUTE AND
IN DUE COURSE MUST BE MET.

IN THE YEAR 1969, IF INDEED THERE WILL BE A YEAR FREE OF MAJOR LEGISLATIVE EFFORT, THERE EXISTS AN OPPORTUNITY FOR BOTH THE ADMINISTRATION AND THE CONGRESS TO CONDUCT SOME WORTHWHILE AND REALISTIC ANALYSIS AND INVENTORY-TAKING IN THIS AREA. THE ECONOMIC AND POLICY ALTERNATIVES SET FORTH AT THIS FORUM, THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S COMMISSION ON FOOD AND FIBER, THE IDEAS ACCUMULATED DURING THE RECENT POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS, THE POSITIONS AND PROPOSALS OF THE POLITICAL PARTIES, THE POLICY PRONOUNCEMENTS OF THE CANDIDATES, THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CAREER GOVERNMENT SERVICE BOTH AT THE STATE AND FEDERAL LEVEL SHOULD CERTAINLY BE WEIGHED AND ANALYZED.

NONE OF THE PROBLEMS FACING RURAL AMERICA ARE GOING TO EVAPORATE SIMPLY BY IGNORING THEM. NEITHER ARE THEY GOING TO BE SOLVED IN A FRAGMENTIZED ATMOSPHERE OF PARTISANSHIP AND RADICAL DISAGREEMENT AMONG FARM PEOPLE AND THEIR LEADERS. THUS THE OPPORTUNITY NOW EXISTS FOR SOME CONSCIENTIOUS COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE AGRICULTURAL LEADERSHIP OF THE NATION IN ORDER TO ATTAIN THE COMMON GOAL OF DEVELOPING THE BEST POSSIBLE PROGRAMS AND POLICIES THAT WILL SHAPE THIS NATION'S AND THE WORLD'S HISTORY FOR THE BALANCE OF THE CENTURY.

AMONG OTHERS, THESE QUESTIONS MUST BE ANSWERED:

1. WHAT ROLE SHOULD GOVERNMENT PLAY IN THE PRODUCTION AND PRICING OF FARM COMMODITIES?
2. HOW CAN RURAL AMERICA SHARE MORE EQUITABLY IN THE NATIONAL PROSPERITY?
3. WHERE WILL ADEQUATE CREDIT AND FINANCING COME FROM FOR A MODERN AGRICULTURAL PLANT?
4. WHAT CAN BE DONE TO STRENGTHEN BOTH COMMERCIAL AND NON-COMMERCIAL AGRICULTURE?
5. HOW CAN WE EXPAND CASH EXPORTS?
6. WHAT WILL BE OUR IMPORT POLICY?
7. WHAT WILL BE THE NATURE AND SCOPE OF OUR FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS AT HOME AND OVERSEAS?
8. HOW WILL CCC INVENTORIES BE MANAGED?
9. WHAT ROLE WILL COOPERATIVES PLAY IN A GROWING AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY?
10. WHAT WILL BE DONE TO MEET THE GROWING FOOD NEEDS OF THE UNDERFED, UNDERDEVELOPED WORLD?

11. IN WHAT DIRECTIONS WILL AGRICULTURE EDUCATION AND EXTENSION GO?
12. WHAT KIND OF SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION EFFORTS ARE NEEDED NOW AND IN THE FUTURE?
13. WHAT IMPROVEMENTS AND EFFICIENCIES ARE POSSIBLE WITHIN THE USDA?
14. WHERE SHOULD AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH EFFORTS BE CONCENTRATED?

YES, THESE QUESTIONS MUST BE ANSWERED ALONG WITH A LOT OF COLLATERAL QUESTIONS, AND UNLESS THE AGRICULTURAL COMMUNITY ANSWERS THEM WITH SOME DEGREE OF COHESION, THEY WILL BE ANSWERED BY PUBLIC POLICY-MAKERS OUTSIDE OF THE AGRICULTURAL WORLD. IT HAS BEEN POINTED OUT THAT IN THE PRESENT HOUSE, ONLY 47 MEMBERS HAVE CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS WITH MORE THAN 20 PERCENT OF THE POPULATION ENGAGED IN AGRICULTURAL PURSUITS. THE 1970 CENSUS WILL AGAIN DRASTICALLY REDUCE THE REPRESENTATION OF RURAL VOTERS. WITH THE PREDOMINANT POLITICAL REPRESENTATION BEING MORE AND MORE CONSTITUTED BY NON-FARM PEOPLE, IT IS OBVIOUS THAT AGRICULTURE CANNOT MUCH LONGER AFFORD THE LUXURY OF UNRESTRAINED INTERNAL DISPUTE. CITY PEOPLE AND CITY CONGRESSMEN HAVE DEMONSTRATED THEY WILL ACCEPT AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS WHICH AT LEAST APPEAR TO BE IN THE GENERAL PUBLIC INTEREST, BUT THEIR PATIENCE IS BEGINNING TO WEAR THIN.

LET US HOPE THEREFORE THAT IN THE YEAR AHEAD WE WILL BE ABLE TO DE-ESCALATE OUR DIFFERENCES AND APPLY REASON AND RESPONSIBILITY TOWARD THE DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS THAT ARE GOOD FOR FARMERS, GOOD FOR RURAL RESIDENTS, GOOD FOR ALL AMERICANS, AND GOOD FOR THE TROUBLED WORLD IN WHICH WE ALL MUST LIVE.

YES, LET US ALL NOW AT LEAST TRY TO ESTABLISH A CONSTRUCTIVE DIALOGUE, FOR WITHOUT IT THE OMINOUS PROSPECT IS FOR AN UNPROMISING ERA OF POLITICAL BICKERING DURING WHICH THE UNFORTUNATE VICTIM WILL BE AMERICAN AGRICULTURE.

* * * * *